COTTON CHATS

FROM

DRAPER COMPANY

SHIPMAN'S
COMMON-SENSE BINDER

PATENTED

JANUARY 19, 1892. APRIL 19, 1904

To open binder, remove the slides from fasteners raise the fasteners to an erect position and then file papers. For punching: lay the papers on covers and mark sheets to correspond with fasteners.

If DUPLICATE is wanted ORDER 25981

ASA L. SHIPMAN'S SONS
MANUFACTURERS,
NEW YORK.

COTTON CHATS

By the Secretary of the
DRAPER COMPANY,
HOPEDALE, MASS.

No. 51. JUNE, 1906.

We have recently received our medal from the St. Louis Exposition, which was awarded us for an exhibit representing our various tenement house designs. We have received medals also from the Paris and Liege Expositions, on these same buildings, as they seem universally accepted as representative of a very high class.

• • •

CHRISTENED ANEW.

In 1898 a circular was issued by the Universal Loom Company of Readville, Mass., referring to the Emery Vertical Loom. John E. Searles appeared as President, and J. Foster Searles as Secretary. Claims of superiority were made for this loom over the ordinary loom, and several of them were put into operation. In 1899 articles appeared in print stating that the Readville Machine Works had put automatic shuttle-changing looms into operation. In April, 1900, Henry L. Harriman read a paper at the Boston meeting of the New England Cotton manufacturers, describing their construction in detail. In July, 1901, we presented evidence in law suits against the American Loom Company, claiming infringement of three of our patents. These suits are still pending.

Several hundred of these early Harriman looms were put in use in various mills. In 1901, J. Foster Searles wrote the Textile World that they had orders from over 60 mills. In 1901, the Lewiston Machine Company also advertised looms built with the Harriman attachments. Without going into detail concerning their operation, we think it undisputed that nearly all of them were later taken out of the mills. In 1901, a trade paper item stated that the American Loom Company, of Readville, Mass., had been bought by a syndicate allied with the American Cotton Company of New York. The further history of the Lewiston Machine Works and the American Cotton Co., is a matter of record. The Geo. W. Stafford Company then appeared as sponsors, presenting a loom under the name of the **Ideal** loom, although, so far as casual observation may determine, it has the same old Harriman shuttle-changer.

Within a few months, a reorganization under a new name has been going on, and stock in the new concern has been offered for public subscription. Large orders from various mills are claimed by the representatives, and the cotton trade in general awaits with interest the further developments in this interesting chain of events. At the May meeting of the American Cotton Manufacturers' Association at Charlotte, N. C., it was understood that a paper referring to this **Ideal** loom, would be presented. Such a paper was **not** read, however, the President of the Association explaining that it had arrived too late, although an agent of the Company, who was present, had announced that he should read the same. It is unfortunate that this paper was not read, and thus made open for criticism, as there were several manufacturers anxious to discuss it. In the Textile Manufacturers' Journal of May 19th, 1906, a transcript of this paper is supposedly presented, as read by S. B. Alexander, of Alexander & Garsed, Southern selling agents. Assuming that this presents the paper that **might** have been read, we take up a few of its peculiar statements. Referring to our own Northrop Loom, it states that, "*there is unquestionably a speed beyond which this rapid change cannot be successfully accomplished. The strain on the filling being naturally great it breaks and frequent stoppages result, all of which of course affects the production, both as to quantity and quality.*" Now, as a matter of fact, the bobbin changing in our loom can be practically and satisfactorily accomplished at speeds higher

than any loom is now run. Speed has nothing whatever to do with the success of the transfer. The "frequent stoppages" from filling breakage referred to must be largely imaginary since it is a matter of record that **the Northrop loom produces a higher percentage of product than any other loom ever known of.** We can furnish plenty of evidence where mills get 95% of product without running over time, and over 100% of product when they let the looms run through the noon hour.

This article also refers to difficulties with *"a bobbin-changing loom using a high take-up roll."* We do not have to use a high take-up roll in our loom; in fact, we build many looms without this high roll. For general weaving we find it distinctly advantageous, however, and we simply give our customers what they require in this connection. Reference is also made to heavy drop wires. We are not limited to any particular weight of wire; in fact, we have standard patterns weighing less than any wire used by competitors. Another interesting sentence states: *"it has been proven time and time again that cop filling cannot be successfully used."* We would simply call attention to the fact that cop changing looms have run successfully for years, both in this and other countries. The Whitman Mills of New Bedford, are today running 800 Northrop looms with cop filling, on very fine yarn. The fact that bobbin filling is cheaper and that many mills have changed from cop to bobbin filling does not prove that the use of cop filling is impractical. The writer of this paper also states that the conditions with the **Ideal** loom are absolutely the same as with the ordinary, plain loom, forgetting that this **Ideal** loom uses as many as 9 shuttles in certain instances, and this is hardly the same as common loom usage, where only two shuttles are used. Our own loom uses but one shuttle, being much simpler than the common loom itself in this respect, and proportionately superior to the **Ideal** loom which introduces nine varying chances for difficulty in setting the pick. The paper also claims that this **Ideal** loom is the heaviest on the market today. From casual observation we are inclined to dispute this contention emphatically, and would like to have definite presentation of facts regarding the actual weight of this loom from the builders, if they insist on the truth of this statement.

The exploiters and promoters of this re-vitalized experiment, have the peculiar advantage of being able to claim

what they are going to do, without assuming responsibility for what this same loom **has heretofore done.** The former introducers of this re-named machine **also made large claims.** We are ourselves on record as claiming considerable for our Northrop loom since its introduction in 1895. We are willing to stand by our claims, and since the results have given us some standing as prophets, we are willing now to go on record as believing that within five years the manufacture and sale of this shuttle-changing loom will have ceased, and that the 8,000 looms now claimed to have been sold by the agents will not then be found running as a whole, if they ever run at all. We can understand how some manufacturers are willing to experiment with a new device when offered to them at a low price, with the understanding that payment is conditioned on approval. We hardly care to sell machinery on that plan ourselves. While we do not believe in the general principle of shuttle-changing looms, we also believe that these looms could not even meet the approval of trial, if they did not employ devices covered by our patents. We are not inclined to allow competitors to use our devices, and we shall ultimately discover whether the courts agree with our interpretation of our own inventions. We dislike to inconvenience any of the cotton mills of this country, but we cannot allow infringement without protest, and the proof of infringement may seriously embarrass the users of the infringing mechanisms, unless they are carefully protected against the possibility of loss.

• • •

BREAKAGE TESTS.

When I first sent for responses from cotton mills as to the advisability of preparing a new table of yarn breaking strength, several hundred mills assured me they would be glad to send yarn for me to test. Some two months ago I reminded these mills of their promise by forwarding tags to be placed on the yarn to be sent. The returns have come in very slowly, and I now call attention to the fact that I would be glad to receive all the yarn possible from all the mills possible, so that the table to be prepared may be based on accurate data.

COTTON CHATS

By the secretary of the
DRAPER COMPANY,
HOPEDALE, MASS.

No. 51. JUNE, 1906.

We have recently received our medal from the St. Louis Exposition, which was awarded us for an exhibit representing our various tenement house designs. We have received medals also from the Paris and Liege Expositions, on these same buildings, as they seem universally accepted as representative of a very high class.

• • •

CHRISTENED ANEW.

In 1898 a circular was issued by the Universal Loom Company of Readville, Mass., referring to the Emery Vertical Loom. John E. Searles appeared as President, and J. Foster Searles as Secretary. Claims of superiority were made for this loom over the ordinary loom, and several of them were put into operation. In 1899 articles appeared in print stating that the Readville Machine Works had put automatic shuttle-changing looms into operation. In April, 1900, Henry L. Harriman read a paper at the Boston meeting of the New England Cotton manufacturers, describing their construction in detail. In July, 1901, we presented evidence in law suits against the American Loom Company, claiming infringement of three of our patents. These suits are still pending.

Several hundred of these early Harriman looms were put in use in various mills. In 1901, J. Foster Searles wrote the Textile World that they had orders from over 60 mills. In 1901, the Lewiston Machine Company also advertised looms built with the Harriman attachments. Without going into detail concerning their operation, we think it undisputed that nearly all of them were later taken out of the mills. In 1901, a trade paper item stated that the American Loom Company, of Readville, Mass., had been bought by a syndicate allied with the American Cotton Company of New York. The further history of the Lewiston Machine Works and the American Cotton Co., is a matter of record. The Geo. W. Stafford Company then appeared as sponsors, presenting a loom under the name of the **Ideal** loom, although, so far as casual observation may determine, it has the same old Harriman shuttle-changer.

Within a few months, a reorganization under a new name has been going on, and stock in the new concern has been offered for public subscription. Large orders from various mills are claimed by the representatives, and the cotton trade in general awaits with interest the further developments in this interesting chain of events. At the May meeting of the American Cotton Manufacturers' Association at Charlotte, N. C., it was understood that a paper referring to this **Ideal** loom, would be presented. Such a paper was **not** read, however, the President of the Association explaining that it had arrived too late, although an agent of the Company, who was present, had announced that he should read the same. It is unfortunate that this paper was not read, and thus made open for criticism, as there were several manufacturers anxious to discuss it. In the Textile Manufacturers' Journal of May 19th, 1906, a transcript of this paper is supposedly presented, as read by S. B. Alexander, of Alexander & Garsed, Southern selling agents. Assuming that this presents the paper that **might** have been read, we take up a few of its peculiar statements. Referring to our own Northrop Loom, it states that, "*there is unquestionably a speed beyond which this rapid change cannot be successfully accomplished. The strain on the filling being naturally great it breaks and frequent stoppages result, all of which of course affects the production, both as to quantity and quality.*" Now, as a matter of fact, the bobbin changing in our loom can be practically and satisfactorily accomplished at speeds higher

than any loom is now run. Speed has nothing whatever to do with the success of the transfer. The "frequent stoppages" from filling breakage referred to must be largely imaginary since it is a matter of record that **the Northrop loom produces a higher percentage of product than any other loom ever known of.** We can furnish plenty of evidence where mills get 95% of product without running over time, and over 100% of product when they let the looms run through the noon hour.

This article also refers to difficulties with "*a bobbin-changing loom using a high take-up roll.*" We do not have to use a high take-up roll in our loom; in fact, we build many looms without this high roll. For general weaving we find it distinctly advantageous, however, and we simply give our customers what they require in this connection. Reference is also made to heavy drop wires. We are not limited to any particular weight of wire; in fact, we have standard patterns weighing less than any wire used by competitors. Another interesting sentence states: "*it has been proven time and time again that cop filling cannot be successfully used.*" We would simply call attention to the fact that cop changing looms have run successfully for years, both in this and other countries. The Whitman Mills of New Bedford, are today running 800 Northrop looms with cop filling, on very fine yarn. The fact that bobbin filling is cheaper and that many mills have changed from cop to bobbin filling does not prove that the use of cop filling is impractical. The writer of this paper also states that the conditions with the **Ideal** loom are absolutely the same as with the ordinary, plain loom, forgetting that this **Ideal** loom uses as many as 9 shuttles in certain instances, and this is hardly the same as common loom usage, where only two shuttles are used. Our own loom uses but one shuttle, being much simpler than the common loom itself in this respect, and proportionately superior to the **Ideal** loom which introduces nine varying chances for difficulty in setting the pick. The paper also claims that this **Ideal** loom is the heaviest on the market today. From casual observation we are inclined to dispute this contention emphatically, and would like to have definite presentation of facts regarding the actual weight of this loom from the builders, if they insist on the truth of this statement.

The exploiters and promoters of this re-vitalized experiment, have the peculiar advantage of being able to claim

what they are going to do, without assuming responsibility for what this same loom **has heretofore done.** The former introducers of this re-named machine **also made large claims.** We are ourselves on record as claiming considerable for our Northrop loom since its introduction in 1895. We are willing to stand by our claims, and since the results have given us some standing as prophets, we are willing now to go on record as believing that within five years the manufacture and sale of this shuttle-changing loom will have ceased, and that the 8,000 looms now claimed to have been sold by the agents will not then be found running as a whole, if they ever run at all. We can understand how some manufacturers are willing to experiment with a new device when offered to them at a low price, with the understanding that payment is conditioned on approval. We hardly care to sell machinery on that plan ourselves. While we do not believe in the general principle of shuttle-changing looms, we also believe that these looms could not even meet the approval of trial, if they did not employ devices covered by our patents. We are not inclined to allow competitors to use our devices, and we shall ultimately discover whether the courts agree with our interpretation of our own inventions. We dislike to inconvenience any of the cotton mills of this country, but we cannot allow infringement without protest, and the proof of infringement may seriously embarrass the users of the infringing mechanisms, unless they are carefully protected against the possibility of loss.

• • •

BREAKAGE TESTS.

When I first sent for responses from cotton mills as to the advisability of preparing a new table of yarn breaking strength, several hundred mills assured me they would be glad to send yarn for me to test. Some two months ago I reminded these mills of their promise by forwarding tags to be placed on the yarn to be sent. The returns have come in very slowly, and I now call attention to the fact that I would be glad to receive all the yarn possible from all the mills possible, so that the table to be prepared may be based on accurate data.